

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91<sup>st</sup> CONGRESS  
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 116—PART 32

DECEMBER 18, 1970, TO DECEMBER 22, 1970  
(PAGES 42329 TO 43588)

force and had had to work for a living, they would be more understanding. Instead they are living off the taxpayers and just dreaming up ways of how to spend the taxpayers' money with no idea of where the money would come from. There is nothing more dangerous to society than an egotistical bureaucrat, and this agency is full of them. It has gotten to the point that it has affected them so that they cannot reason clearly.

All we need to solve this problem is some good commonsense. These are some of the mathematics involved in this bill before us. I do not think any Senator here could get up on any platform in any State, before any audience, and explain and defend this plan if they showed it to the people and explained how it would work. I do not care if it would be in the poorer sections or the richest of an area. I do not think he would be able to convince anyone that we should have a welfare program in which the person who works will get less than the man who stays on welfare. They do not want that kind of program. Not one single Senator will endorse that kind of program.

My question then is, Why vote for it at this time? Why not recognize that this bill should not become the law? Why not lay it aside? We know it is not going to become law at this session anyway. Why not strip the bill down to the first two titles, which deal with social security and medicaid reform? Why not strike out titles III, IV, and V, strike out the pending amendment on trade, strike out the pending Scott amendment, strike out the Ribicoff amendment, and have a gentleman's agreement that neither the trade amendment nor the family assistance plan nor the guaranteed annual wage will be offered in this bill? Why not say that they are going to be put over into the next session, and then dispose of the medicaid sections and the social security sections, and send it to conference?

I say that as one who is not going to block a vote on this question, if Senators want to have one. But I will regret, and I will leave the Senate somewhat disillusioned, if the Senate passes these provisions by rollcall votes, and then perhaps following that votes for a 10-percent increase in social security benefits and a \$100 minimum, knowing at the same time that this bill is not going to become law.

Right now, on Christmas Eve, I think that would just be the cruelest political hoax this Senate could perpetrate on the aged. I hope the Senate will not do it.

If we strike from the bill titles III, IV, and V, strip the bill at the same time of amendments which are pending and which are nongermane—the Ribicoff amendment on welfare and the trade amendment—and have a gentlemen's agreement that we are not going to pursue them in this session of Congress, whether we are for them or against them, and do the business of this Congress, then I think we will be well advised to go home.

This Congress has done enough to the taxpayers and the sooner it adjourns the better for our country.

Let the administration appoint a committee from the Finance Committee, the

Ways and Means Committee, and other interested parties and try to come up with a plan that will work mathematically and not have these quirks in it.

It can be done. Let them come up here with such a plan, present it to Congress, and if it is a reasonable plan, one that has a true work incentive to carry out what the Senator from Illinois wants, what the President wants, and what every one says he is for, I am confident Congress will pass it.

But if they cannot come up with such a plan, let us not put one on the books, that we know will not work.

Mr. President, I have gone beyond my time. In line with the previous request, I yield the floor.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, looking forward to the time when it might be in order to consider the various alternatives that might be suggested in order to expedite consideration of this bill, and in order to facilitate the consideration of it by Senators, I am going to ask that the bill be printed with each committee amendment numbered.

In that way, Senators can notify me or other members of the committee which amendments, if any, they consider controversial to the extent that they would not be willing to agree to a limitation of debate on those amendments, and we could take that into consideration with regard to any motions to limit debate or to recommit with instructions, or any of the various procedural motions that might be available to the managers of the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed with the amendments numbered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears non, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I would just like to take a few moments of the Senate's time to report that I have been reliably advised that the negotiations between the Japanese Government and our Government over textile quotas were on the verge of a successful agreement, but before that was announced, a decision was made by the U.S. Government to back off from our proposal.

This is a report that comes from an indirect source, but it comes from a source that at least seems to me to be reliable, and I think it is terribly important, before we act on any trade legislation which has been predicated on the theory that it was necessary to force some kind of agreement, to find out whether in fact our negotiators were on the verge of a textile agreement, and whether that could now be quickly put into effect, and would nullify the need for any further consideration of the proposed textile restrictions.

I am further advised that the textile industry, when advised of our proposal, involved themselves quickly to encourage our Government to back off from any agreement. That would certainly be a strange change of strategy, because all along we have been told that if only the Japanese would agree to some kind of voluntary restrictions in the manmade and woolens field, as they had already agreed in the cotton field, it would not be

necessary to proceed with formal statutory quotas.

Apparently once that had been achieved or nearly achieved, if my information is correct, the textile industry in this country changed its mind and urged our Government to back away from its proposal and from the imminent agreement. For what reasons I am not told, but one of them might be that they were aware that the Senate was considering formal statutory textile import quotas, and felt that they could do far better with such statutory restrictions than they could with the kind of an agreement which I had understood they had sought and which I have now been advised was near a successful culmination.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MONDALE. I would first like to conclude my statement.

I think that this information, which has, as I say, been relayed through informal sources, ought to be the basis for an inquiry, and I shall make such an inquiry to our Government, to determine whether an agreement has been reached, how close to an agreement we are if it has not been reached, and the extent to which it is possible to now conclude that the informal understanding that had been sought is now within reach, and that, therefore, to proceed further with statutory proposals for import quotas becomes unnecessary.

I am glad to yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. Would the Senator mind revealing to the Senate the source of this information?

Mr. MONDALE. I am not at liberty to do so. I do say I received it from a source I regard to be reliable. But in any event, I am sure our Government could quickly advise us of the facts.

I thought this disclosure was of sufficient urgency, in the light of the pending legislation, that it should be made public, and that we should find out from our Government precisely what the situation is.

Mr. ERVIN. Is the Senator unwilling to disclose the source of his information, so that some of the rest of us might be enabled to ponder whether it is reliable or not?

Mr. MONDALE. Well, I would only say to the Senator from North Carolina that the source, which asked not to be disclosed, is known to me as being very reliable. But in any event, we can quickly hear from the administration if they wish to disclose what those facts are regarding our latest proposal to the Japanese and one degree to which we backed off from this proposal upon pressure from the textile industry.

Mr. ERVIN. Well, I would say to the Senator from Minnesota that, while not undertaking to dictate conduct on the part of other Senators, the Senator from North Carolina would never convey to the Senate publicly information from somebody who was unwilling to allow his identity to be disclosed.

Mr. MONDALE. I say to the Senator from North Carolina that if this information which I have received from what I regard to be a reliable source is accu-

rate, and Congress is not being advised of this important step, it is a very, very serious matter, which undermines the integrity of the legislative process, and I considered it to be of sufficiently serious import to raise this matter at this time, hoping for a prompt answer from the administration.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. ERVIN. In other words, the Senator did not receive this information from Old Nicodemus, who travels only by night?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONDALE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, these seem to me to be very serious charges. I think that for the Senate to proceed on the assumption that they deserve credence would be a very risky operation. I can only say to my good friend from Minnesota, for whom I have the highest regard, that it would seem to me that if there is validity to the contentions that he has disclosed just now to us, we ought to be entitled to know specifically what has been revealed by his sources, and those sources should come forth and identify themselves; and until they do, I would hope that the Senate would give no credence to them. It reminds me of stories that were heard during World War II, when there were all sorts of rumors about peace. It took a long time after those first rumors were heard before we actually had any peace.

I do not mean at all to impugn the message that has been brought to us by my good friend from Minnesota. But I say that I think it is important that we know, first of all, specifically who is making such a statement, and then check out with sources in the administration the accuracy of those statements. After these steps have been taken, if they both disclose that the statements indeed deserve credibility and are true, then I would say at that time, and only at that time, is it proper to lay aside any consideration of a bill that has, in the main, the endorsement of this administration, a bill that is supported by a number of Senators on this floor, as was evidenced by a vote earlier. Until that sort of documentation can be provided the Senate, I would hope that we would give no further serious consideration to the charge.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONDALE. I would not have said what I just said unless I were convinced that there was a serious basis for it. I think this is one of the problems of trying to operate on such sweeping legislation under conditions 1 minute to midnight before the adjournment of this Congress, when there is no longer time to hold hearings to explore such things as the feasibility of such textile agreements or other kinds of international understandings. As I have said, I received this information from a source in which I believe to be sufficiently credible.

Mr. HANSEN. I have no doubt of that.

Mr. MONDALE. I thought it ought to be raised. If it is wrong, it is wrong, and the administration can tell us. But I re-

ceived it from a sufficiently credible source that I thought it ought to be raised.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONDALE. I yield.

Mr. FANNIN. Would the Senator be willing to say whether or not he received it in writing or whether it was just a conversation, and why he would consider it so reliable when we have had rumors about rumors coming along on this subject? As the Senator knows, we have had information in the press continuously about these rumors, but they are just rumors.

I have been checking very carefully on this matter, and I certainly have no indication, and in talking with members of the administration have no indication, of anything like this happening. We know that just the opposite has been happening so far as the formal reports are concerned. Is it in writing?

Mr. MONDALE. I think that is immaterial. I can only repeat what I have said. I received it from a source and in a manner which I found persuasive.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONDALE. I yield.

Mr. DOLE. When the Senator received the information, was any effort made to check it with any administration official?

Mr. MONDALE. An effort was made to check it insofar as I felt I could. As I said, I am sufficiently convinced that it is a credible source, and I thought the announcement of what I had learned should be made at this time.

Mr. DOLE. Did the Senator make the announcement and then check with the administration?

Mr. MONDALE. I have checked as far as I felt I could. I think it is a serious allegation. The administration could make its response.

Mr. DOLE. With whom did the Senator check?

Mr. MONDALE. I will not go beyond what I have just said.

Mr. DOLE. The Senator cannot even reveal the source with which he checked?

Mr. MONDALE. I have gone as far as I am going to go on that.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONDALE. I yield.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I was busy conferring with the distinguished Senator from Connecticut (Mr. Ribicoff) and the distinguished Senator from Delaware at the time the Senator made his statement, so I did not hear it. But I am told that he said that, on some source, he understands that an agreement with Japan on textiles has been entered into. Is that correct?

Mr. MONDALE. I have been told that it either had been entered into or was at least imminent, and that the textile industry got word of this, and our negotiators backed away from this allegedly near-agreement. So either an understanding has not been disclosed or we backed off from what was on the verge of an understanding in order to leave us in a position where we would continue to believe that it was futile to anticipate or contemplate that such an agreement was possible.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I should like to add this information to the colloquy. If such an agreement has been arrived at, it must have been within the last 2 days, which surprises me very much, because 2 days ago, acting in the place of the minority leader, I met with representatives of the Japanese Government in my office. I will have to check and get the names. The names of Japanese officials are difficult to remember and pronounce. They were representatives of the Embassy, and one was a distinguished member of the Japanese Diet, who came to me to plead with me to see if our Government would not change its bargaining position, that they were too far apart and they could not possibly agree to the severe conditions that our Government was insisting upon in the negotiations.

So I will have to say that that is very surprising to me, and I suppose it would be surprising to the officials of the Japanese Government who apparently do not know that such an agreement was arrived at.

Mr. MONDALE. I am told that this development occurred within the last 2 or 3 days.

Mr. ERVIN. Will the Senator from Minnesota pardon the Senator from North Carolina if the Senator from North Carolina would remind the Senator from Minnesota that these negotiations have been carried on under the auspices of the Department of Commerce, and if the Senator from North Carolina would further suggest to the Senator from Minnesota that there is a telephone line—many telephone lines—to the Department of Commerce, which could have been resorted to in order to ascertain the validity of these rumors?

Mr. MONDALE. As the Senator from North Carolina may know, these negotiations are being conducted under the direction of Mr. Peter Flanigan, of the White House.

Mr. ERVIN. But the Senator knows that the Department of Commerce has worked on them in conjunction. As a matter of fact, the Secretary of Commerce has personally attempted to get negotiations underway and has engaged in many of them himself.

Mr. MONDALE. It is my understanding, and has been for some time, that the principal negotiator for the textile agreements is Mr. Flanigan, although initially the Commerce Department and its Secretary were principally involved, and that the situation as I describe it is now essentially correct.

Mr. ERVIN. I will ask the Senator from Minnesota whether he has any reason to believe that Mr. Flanigan cannot be reached by telephone?

Mr. MONDALE. Just permit me to say that, as I indicated earlier, I have received this information from a reliable source. I believe that it is essentially accurate. At this moment, with so few legislative hours to go, and affecting, as it does, a fundamental issue of national trade policy, I thought it important to make this known.

Mr. ERVIN. Does the Senator from Minnesota think they are going to decide national trade policies on such rumors as this?

Mr. MONDALE. For example, just a few moments ago it was proposed that we agree on a unanimous time agreement on the trade legislation, which could have been taken and agreed to without knowledge of this occurrence. I think that would be a very serious situation.

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator from North Carolina would be very glad to vote early Monday morning on the trade agreement and would make a unanimous-consent request to that effect had he any anticipation that it might be granted.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONDALE. I yield.

Mr. STEVENS. What type of agreement was contemplated by the report the Senator has—a voluntary agreement on the part of the Japanese to limit their exports to this country? I do not quite understand the nature of the agreement the Senator indicates was about to be entered.

Mr. MONDALE. This is at the heart of the whole controversy surrounding the need for legislation to impose arbitrary trade quotas by statute affecting textiles. The argument has been widely discussed that if only the Japanese would reach an understanding with our Government for some sort of informal restraint on the importation or the exportation of Japanese textiles into the United States, an understanding affecting manmade and woolen fabrics, such as that which now has been reached and long since reached in the cotton textile field, it might not then be necessary to have statutory restrictions.

The development which I have reported earlier would have a fundamental bearing on whether any action would be needed by Congress by way of statutory restrictions on textile quotas.

Mr. STEVENS. If I may interrupt there—

Mr. MONDALE. Because we are within minutes or hours or days from adjournment of this Congress, because we are being presented with proposals for limiting debate on the trade bill which I regard as being one involving revolutionary changes in American trade policy, and because I received the information I had earlier reported on the source which I found to be fully credible, I thought it important to make that disclosure.

Mr. STEVENS. I might say to the Senator that I happen to be one of those who voted with him on this matter, but on the other hand, if the Senator's report is one on a voluntary quota system, which is what the Japanese Government saw fit to impose on the steel exports about 2 years ago and then promptly disregarded, I might seriously have to consider changing my mind. It may be that if the Senator is indicating we should not act in the Congress on the basis of some unilateral representation to the Japanese Government, that they are ready now to take action and indicate, because the passage of the trade bill is imminent, that they would be willing to enter into some form of voluntary agreement on their part, that is one thing; but if the Senator is indicating that our Government and theirs are about ready to enter into a

solemn agreement that would be presented to the Senate for ratification, that is an entirely different matter. If I had been the Senator, I would have checked that out before putting it out to the public.

Mr. MONDALE. This is not a proposed treaty which would require our ratification. This is an informal trade proposal between the United States and Japan. My understanding is that the proposal that was offered either provided the basis of agreement or was immediately in danger of providing the basis of agreement and was an offer by this Government to the Japanese.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

#### COMPREHENSIVE ALCOHOL TREATMENT BILL

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain remarks of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK) concerning the comprehensive alcohol treatment bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

##### STATEMENT OF SENATOR DOMINICK

Mr. President, we have before us today the final version of a bill which is of paramount importance to all Americans. I am speaking of the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1970. This bill has been given careful consideration by the members of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee in this body and by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in the House of Representatives. Both Committees reported the bill to the floor of their respective houses unanimously. Both Houses have passed the bill as reported from their Committees unanimously. It is my opinion that this bill should be adopted today, and I urge all my colleagues to vote for this bill.

The need for this legislation is clear. It has been estimated that there are possibly 18 million alcoholics and problem drinkers in this nation. Alcohol contributed to some 25,000 deaths in automobile accidents and at least 800,000 crashes involving a tragic amount of injury, suffering and property damage.

Perhaps the most tragic aspect of this problem is the great personal losses which are not purely physical in nature. The families and friends of an alcoholic as well as the alcoholic himself suffer much in damaged personal relations.

Another aspect of this problem is the great cost to American industry. A recent Labor Department publication estimated the cost of alcohol abuse to industry at nearly \$3 billion dollars. In a report to our Subcommittee on Alcoholism and Narcotics, the Comptroller General of the United States estimated that alcoholism in Federal employment may be resulting in costs of \$275 million to \$550 million annually. The report also estimated that a program costing only \$15 million per year might result in cost savings of \$135 to \$280 million annually.

These figures only illustrate what a tragic problem alcohol abuse is in our nation. They do not and cannot reflect the human loss in wasted lives that alcohol abuse causes.

Clearly the need for this program is well established. Let us take the proper steps and pass this bill today.

This legislation has a number of major components which should be discussed. It

establishes a comprehensive range of administrative tools in a single visible and broadly based Institute structure within the National Institute of Mental Health and gives a strong mandate for leadership and action to the Federal Government. The legislation provides for a carefully structured program for Federal assistance to States and local groups and organizations to encourage community based planning for and development of effective treatment and rehabilitation programs throughout the country for alcoholics. It requires the establishment of programs of prevention and the recognition and encouragement of treatment and rehabilitation programs for Federal employees. It provides sufficient funding authorizations to enable a program of necessary magnitude to get underway immediately.

This legislation will make it possible for the Institute to make grants to public and private nonprofit agencies, organizations, and institutions and enter into contracts with public or private agencies and individuals to develop programs for the prevention and treatment of alcohol abuse and alcoholism. It is vitally important for these programs to be community based, and to utilize public health rather than criminal or other punitive measures, in order to provide the most effective treatment possible. The bill provides a mechanism for processing applications for financial assistance made by units of local government and private organizations. Applications will be channeled through the agency designated to administer the alcoholism program within the State. The State agency will have an opportunity to comment upon the propriety of the particular plan under scrutiny, but may not prevent it from being sent to the Institute for consideration. As with formula grants, the money which is made available through project grants will be used to supplement rather than replace funds which the States or localities would otherwise have devoted to alcohol programs.

The bill will authorize a 3 year program of \$300 million to carry out these grant programs. \$180 million will be for formula grants to the states while \$120 million will be for project grants.

Mr. President this is a well thought out program. It has been labored on long and hard by the Special Subcommittee on Alcoholism and Narcotics. The Chairman of the Subcommittee, Senator Hughes, has provided outstanding leadership in bringing this legislation to a reality. The senior Senator from New York, Mr. Javits, has worked diligently in moving this legislation through Committee.

This careful consideration coupled with the urgent need for action call for immediate passage of this bill so that it can be cleared for signature by the President. I strongly hope that my colleagues will pass this critical bill today.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 578) to include firefighters within the provisions of section 8336(c) of title 5, United States Code, relating to the retirement of Government employees engaged in certain hazardous occupations.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee, of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 380) to repeal section 7 of the act of August 9, 1946 (60 Stat. 968).